

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON THE

Two last 30th of *January*
SERMONS,

The One preached to the
Honourable House of COMMONS,

The Other to the
Lower House of CONVOCATION. *Wm Binches*

IN A.

LETTER.



L O N D O N,

Printed in the Year 1702.

ANIMADVERSTIONS

ON THE

Two last parts of

THE R. M. O. N.

The One part of

THE R. M. O. N.



*Animadversions on the two last
January-Sermons, &c.*

Feb. 22. 1701.

S I R

EVER since you desired me to write my Thoughts to you concerning the two Sermons which you sent me, I have been continually interrupted with Business of one sort or another, so that this is the first leisure Day I have had to answer your Request. I have read both the Sermons, and find that the great Design carried on in the Sermon to the Commons is, to perswade good Men that they do avoid the Conversation of ill People; and likewise to perswade that the great distinguishing Mark by which good and ill Men can be discern'd is, viz. that one sort abhor the benecking of King *Charles I.* as a most vile and barbarous Act of Injustice and Inhumanity, whilst the other sort of Men have not conceived so great an Abhorrence of that Fact.

Now as to the general Doctrine, *i.e.* that good Men should not contract Familiarity with the contrary sort, I think 'tis an innocent Doctrine, and supported by the Preacher with very good Reasons. But then methinks 'tis as needless a Doctrine as can be preached to Men of common Sense; for the young giddy-headed Boys, and half-witted People may through want of Consideration be decoy'd into ill Company, and thereby be drawn into Inconveniences, yet to suppose that Men of Honour and Virtue or good Sense (as we may reckon the Members of Parliament to be) should stand in need of such a Warning, seems a thing strange to me. But amongst the common People of *England* (and I suppose of all other Nations) an honest Man will avoid Familiarity with a Knave, a well-natur'd kind Man will not care to converse with a cross peevish ill-natur'd Person; he who is charitable to the poor, hateth the Humour of a close-fisted covetous Niggard; a fair bold open-hearted Man will not endure the Conversation of a sly complaisant plausible Companion who is full of Trick and Designs; and a Man of Worth who loves his King and Country will not like the Conversation of worthless Sycophants, who under pretence of Loyalty, have flattered the Father and Son into such Measures as have been inconsistent with the Welfare of both King and People, nor of those who are still promoting the same Principles, by
which

which the Monarchy and Church of *England* have been twice overturn'd in the space of one half Century. But

What the Doctor chiefly would infer, is, that whosoever does not abhor the Execution of King *Charles I.* is so ill a Person, that no good Man may converse with him. This is what the Doctor would perswade, without entering into the Merit of the Cause. Methinks 'tis something arbitrary to discard Men from the Benefits of human Society before their Cause has been heard. In the Spiritual Courts our Lords the Bishops hear all Allegations which are brought both for, and against the Person accused; and likewise give him Admonition before they proceed to Excommunication. But the Doctor excommunicates without a fair Hearing of the Cause. Those who do not abhor the Execution of King *Charles*, do allow that there is no Law of *England*, in virtue whereof the Subjects to the King of *England* may condemn their King to Death: but yet since they know that there is a Law of God which saith that *he who sheds Man's Blood, by Man shall his Blood be shed*, Gen. 9. 6. which Law was given out not to the Sons of *Israel*, but of *Noah*: And since they conceive that King *Charles I.* was a Shedder of Blood in a very great measure, and after a very barbarous manner, they do not abhor that the Law of God was executed upon the Person of King *Charles I.* And

And if that King gave out a Commission under the broad Seal of Scotland to the *Irish* Papists with these Words in it, *Know ye therefore that We reposing much Care and Trust in your Dutys and Obedience, do hereby give unto you full Power and Authority to use all politick Ways and Means possible to possess your selves of all the Forts, Castles, and Places of Strength and Defence within the said Kingdom (viz. Ireland) and also to arrest and seize the Goods, Estates, and Persons of the English Protestants (in some Copies 'tis Puritans instead of Protestants) to our use.* And suppose that hereupon an *Irish* Popish Council was formed at *Kilkenny*, which directed a bloody Massacre of Protestants, to the Number of between two and three hundred thousand Men, Women, and Children, who did not deliver up their Goods, Estates, and Persons into the Hands of *Irish* Papists, according to his Majesty's Commission: I say, if this matter of Fact appear'd true, and his Blood was thereupon shed, the Law of God was fulfilled, tho not according to the legal Forms and Usages of this Land.

Now altho this Commission was granted before you and I were born, yet I see no doubt to question the Truth thereof, any more than of any other part of History; especially since this part of King *Charles* the first's Story has in our days receiv'd Confirmation from his Son King *Charles* II. The Case was this:

The

The Marquiss of *Antrim* in the Kingdom of *Ireland* was accused of being a Principal in the *Irish* Massacre, and in order that his Estate should be forfeited therefore, these eight Articles were proved against the Marquiss. 1st. That he was to have had a Hand in surprizing the Castle of *Dublin*, in the Year 1641. 2^{dly}. That he was of the Rebels Party, which was made appear by his frequent Intercourse with *Renny O More* and many others, being himself the most notorious of the Rebels. 3^{dly}. That he entred into the *Roman* Catholick Confederacy before the Year 1643. 4^{thly}. That he constantly adhered to the Nuncio's Party. 5^{thly}. That he sat from time to time in the Supreme Council of *Kilkenny*. 6^{thly}. That he sign'd the execrable Oath of Association. 7^{thly}. That he was commissioned and acted as Lieutenant General from the said Assembly at *Kilkenny*. 8^{thly}. That he declared himself, by several Letters of his own penning, to have been, in conjunction with *Owen Ro O Neale*, a constant Opposer to the several Peaces made by the Lord Lieutenant with the *Irish*. Now tho these Depositions were transmitted from the Privy Council of *Ireland* to King *Charles* the 2^d, yet the said King sent back a Letter to the Duke of *Ormond*, then Lord Deputy of *Ireland*, to clear the said Marquiss of *Antrim*. In which Letter 'tis alledged, That the Marquiss was innocent from any Malice or rebellious Purpose against the Crown;

Crown; and that his Transactions with the Irish Rebels was by the Instruction of the King his Father, and for his Service; that his Royal Father was well pleased with what the Marquiss did, after he had done it, and approv'd the same: And that he (Charles the 2d) would not in Justice deny him this Testimony: That what he did by way of Correspondence with the Irish Rebels, was in order to the Service of his Royal Father, and warranted by his Instructions, and the Trust reposed in him. This Letter was dated from Whitehal, July the 10th, 1663. and entred at the Signet July the 13th following. Now altho I do not believe that King Charles the 1st designed the Irish Massacre, yet that the Papists grounded their Massacre upon this Commission is past Dispute. The Commission threw the Protestants into the Mouth of the Papists, and they devoured them; and if the King emitted this Commission, he was a culpable Cause of all that Slaughter: And 'tis hard that one must be denied the Society of good Men, because he believes a Matter of Fact to be true, which is supported by very probable Arguments.

Again, some take it into their Consideration, who it was that began the long Civil War, whether the King or the Parliament; or rather who was the culpable Cause of that Difference between King and People, which broke out into a Civil War. If the King thro neglect of his Duty was the occasion of the War, the Blood which was shed

shed lay at his Door, and then his Punishment was just according to God's Law. Now as far as I have read into the History of those Times, the matter was thus.

The Parliament which sat down in the Year 1640. petitioned the King to grant them a Request, which was contained in 19 Propositions. The Substance of all which you have in these three things: 1st. That the great Trusts of the Nation should not be disposed of by the King without the Consent of Parliament. 2^{dly}. That the Church-Government should be settled by Parliament. And 3^{dly}. That the Laws should be executed against Papists. He who has read the old History of *English Affairs*, such as *Matthew Paris's*, &c. will find that in antient days the great Trusts of the Nation were disposed of by Consent of Parliament: So that as to that matter of their Request, 'twas only in behalf of an antient Right. And since all Church Authority, as to the execution thereof, is derived from the Civil Power, 'twas not unreasonable for the Parliament to take that matter under Consideration; 'twas likewise highly reasonable that good Laws should be executed at any time. If these Demands had been granted, no Quarrel or War had ensued; but the King by a resolute Denial of these Requests drew a War on himself and the Nation, which ended in the Effusion of his own Blood: But the Blood of many

B

innocent

innocent Men had been shed upon this occasion before the King answered for it by his Blood. Without doubt those Men who condemned and executed the King, were of Opinion that he was the culpable Cause of the War ; and also that the Blood of one Man was but a mean Atonement for the Blood of many, which was spill'd thro the King's Denial of what he ought in Right and Reason to have granted to his People. But let that be as it will, and let us suppose a Man to be led into a mistake concerning the Decollation ; 'tis still hard that a Man should be deprived of the Society of good Men, only by reason of such a Mistake, which is grounded upon an Argument seemingly very probable.

Especially when 'tis considered that no Law or Constitution of Man's making can make void, or so much as supersede the Law of God : And then if we suppose the King to have been a Spiller of Blood, the Law of God ought to take place upon him, notwithstanding the *English* Constitution should forbid it.

But suppose all this to be false Reasoning, yet still 'tis hard that a Man who cannot see into the Fallacy of this Argument should be debarred the Conversation of good Men, especially if this mistaken Man, as to his Opinion of this matter, should nevertheless be a Man of good Morals ; if he live in a due Fear and Reverence of God, with Love
and

and Kindness towards his Neighbour, and be watchful over himself, making it his hearty and constant Endeavour both to know and do the Will of God. Perhaps you will say he approves of a foul Murder. I say no, he abhors Murder; but he thinks the King was a Blood-spiller, and that therefore according to the indispenfible Law of God his Blood was innocently fhed. Now let us fuppofe this Man to be miftaken in the Fact it felf, or in his applying of God's Law to the Fact; 'tis yet hard that he fhould be deprived of the Society of Mankind for fuch a Miftake. As on the other hand, fuppofe the King had given out a Commiffion on purpofe to murder the Proteftants, fuppofe him to have degenerated from a King into a Tyrant, and added Perjury to his Tyranny by overruling the Laws of *England* which he had fworn to maintain: Suppofe that on a certain 30th day of *January* he had figned a Commiffion for raifing *German* Horfe, and bringing them into *England* to over-aw the Parliament; and fuppofing that God's Juftice and not the Peoples Injuftice had overtaken him at laft: And after all this, fuppofe the Doctor not only excufeth all this foul matter, but preaches this Man up for a Saint: I fhould think it a hard Ufage to exclude this Doctor from the Society of good Men, becaufe he is miftaken in the Hiftory of King *Charles the 1ft*; but I would wifh to him the Converfation of the wifeft and moft knowing

Men in *England* to rectify his Mistakes either in that Affair or any other matter. For all this while the Doctor may be a very honest, tho mistaken Man, being still as far as any Man living from designing to pay Saint-like Honours to a Tyrant.

And therefore to the Doctor's Question, *Can those who are unwilling to condemn, who are willing to excuse, who are daring enough to applaud the Fact of this Day, offer any one Shadow of Argument to mitigate its Guilt, or to lessen or detract from it?* It may be replied, 'tis possible that some Reasons may be given which he has not consider'd, or such Reasons may be given which may prevail over the Understandings of weak Men, altho the Doctor may be able to give a full Answer to them. It may be replied, that the Doctor is not a Judge for those who dissent from him in this matter, but they are to judge for themselves as to what they will abhor, and what not. And this (as I conceive) must be the Doctor's Answer, if he should be asked what Shadow of an Argument can any Man bring for excommunicating those, who having heard from credible Testimony that King *Charles I.* was a Favourer of Popery, having in a Letter called the Pope his most Holy Father, having agreed in the Articles of his Marriage that Papists should be protected from the Laws of the Land, having granted pardons to Papists and Jesuits which passed by immediate Warrant, having inhibited both Ecclesiastical and
Temporal

Temporal Officers to intermeddle with Papists, which amounted to a Toleration against Law: Who likewise having heard from credible Testimony, that King *Charles I.* was a Favourer of Tyranny; having raised an Army, and without Consent of Parliament having required the Country to find Coat and Conduct-Money for them; having also levied Ship-money by his own Authority, having likewise imprisoned those who refused to subscribe unwarranted Loans; having levied Subsidies of Tonnage and Poundage, which were determined by his Father's Death; having on the 30th of *January* sent a Privy Seal to the Treasury for the remitting 30000 l. to *Barlmark* a Dutch Merchant to be employed for levying Horse and Men to be brought into *England*, for support of his foremention'd illegal Practices; having also imprisoned some Members of the House of Commons during a Session of Parliament for refusing to answer out of Parliament as to what was said and done in the Parliament House, imprisoning other Members upon managing a Conference with the Lords about the Duke of *Buckingham*, and threatening the Parliament that if they did not answer his Expectations he would resort to other means: I was saying, what Shadow of an Argument can be brought to mitigate the Guilt of such a King, or to excuse him from suffering what his Actions deserved? Can the Doctor return any Answer but this?

this ? Either that he does not believe these Allegations to be true, or if they were true, they did not deserve the Punishment which was inflicted. As to the first part of the Doctor's Answer, it will be replied, that as long as the Credit of Mr. *Rushworth's* Collections holds good, these and many more Facts such as these will be believed by many Men ; who will also think that since our Laws inflict Death for smaller Offences than these are, and since God's Law does not except a King from Death when he deserves it ; I say they will think the Fact of that Day to have been agreeable to natural Justice, and to the written Law of God, tho it were not warranted by the legal Forms of Judicature established in this Realm.

But then when the Doctor proceeds to enquire, that supposing there had been any ground of Complaints, yet how was Vengeance theirs, or whence had they Authority to repay it ? All that I have heard say as to that matter amounts only to this, viz. supposing that passive Obedience be the Subject's Duty to a King acting in an arbitrary manner, and bearing down the Laws of the Land, and the legal Establishment, then the People are indeed incapacitated to do themselves Right by any Means whatsoever. But if this sort of passive Obedience be not a Duty incumbent, and then we should suppose a King to have broken his Oath to his People, and thereby have made void the Peo-
ples

ples Allegiance which was built upon his supposed
 Precontract of governing according to Law, so
 that the Civil Government is hereby dissolved; in
 such a case the Law of Nature takes place, accord-
 ing to which every Man may do himself right up-
 on those who do him wrong. But suppose this An-
 swer to the Doctor's Question be yet insufficient,
 and likewise that a Man deserves Excommunicati-
 on for disagreeing with the Doctor's Opinion, yet
 the question will recoil upon the Doctor, *How*
comes Vengeance to be his? How comes the Doctor,
 who as yet is not a Bishop, to excommunicate the
 Unfortunate out of the Pulpit? Whereas this ju-
 dicial Office belongs only to the Bishops and their
 Consistory-Courts. Indeed after the Bishop has
 cast Men out from the Society of good Christians,
 'tis the Duty of the inferior Clergy to admonish
 all good Christian People to avoid their Company.
 But 'tis the present Misfortune of our Church,
 that the inferior Clergy give themselves too much
 to Contention, not only with their worthy Superi-
 ors in the Church, but with their supreme Metro-
 politan, and endeavour to wrest that Power out
 of his Hand by which the Order of the Christian
 Church has been preserved for more than a thou-
 sand years. What is now become of St. Ignatius's
 Doctrine, who zealously advised all Christians to
 do nothing without their Bishop, when the Cler-
 gy of the Church of *England*, which was reform'd
 in

in her Discipline exactly according to the primitive Pattern, will withdraw their Canonical Obedience from their Arch-Bishop, whose primitive Piety (particularly in his Care of the Poor) and true Christian Moderation is known to all Men, altho not imitated by all?

But to return to the *Shibboleth*, which the Doctor hath found out for a Mark of Distinction between good and ill Men. I can remember the Time when the Doctrine which the Doctor has now preached, was really put in practice for many years together, just after the Restoration of King *Charles II.* For then the Royalists withdrew themselves from the Society of the Presbyterians, altho a few years before those two Partys had joined together to bring back the King : but notwithstanding the Presbyterians had made what Reparation they could to the Father by restoring his Son to the Throne, to whom also they sware Allegiance ; yet all their Loyalty did not give Satisfaction to the Royalists, who not only withdrew themselves from all Familiarity with them, but conceived such a Hatred (the necessary Consequence of such a Separation) to them, as soon broke out into a severe Persecution, whereby Charity was sacrificed to the more necessary Duty of Conformity, the Communion of Saints was limited to Parties, the Strength of the Nation weakned by Division, and the King lost one Moiety of his Crown

Crown by withdrawing from a great part of his People : And after all it did not then appear that these Withdrawers from those who did not abhor the *January* Execution, were Men of any more exalted Piety than others were. And should the same Doctrine be put in practice at present, it might indeed tend to introduce a Persecution instead of the present Toleration, but would not improve the Vertue of those who so greatly abhor the Decollation.

To conclude this point, I cannot agree with the Doctor, that Men should separate from one another upon the account of Opinions; but I rather think it more agreeable, that notwithstanding such difference they should be *like-minded* towards one another, *i. e.* not differ in Affections. Suppose the Doctor should think him to be a Martyr, whom I suppose to be a Traytor, why should we quarrel about it, when perhaps neither of us may be in the right? We can do him no good if we were agreed in the same Opinion about him, since an irreversible Sentence is already passed upon him.

Having now shewn you my Opinion concerning the Doctrine of the Day, I shall proceed (as you desired) to let you know my Thoughts concerning the Day it self, which the Doctor hopes *will be long preserved for the Terror of evil Works,* Pag. 6.

And hereupon I must inform you, that I have such a Respect to the Peace of a Society, and the Laws of the Land where I live, that I am inclined to obey the Law, altho I am not satisfied in the Reason of it, or in the necessity of such a Law. As to instance, the Law commands me to do such a thing, viz. to keep Fast and go to Church on the 30th day of January. I see no Sin in obeying this Law, and therefore I will obey, altho I my self can see no Reason to uphold this Law, but rather see Cause to abolish it.

The common Reason for upholding this Day, is, that by our Humiliation thereupon we might implore the Forgiveness of God, with particular relation to the great crying Sin of the Land, in putting King Charles to Death upon that Day. Now suppose it were a crying Sin, yet it affected only those who were guilty of it; and according to Abraham's Notion of God he may be more inclined to spare a Land for the Innocence of a few, than to involve the Innocent in the guilt of the Nocent. Peradventure there shall be fifty Righteous in the City, wilt thou also not spare the Place for the fifty Righteous that are therein? That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the Righteous with the Wicked, that be far from thee; shall not the Judge of all the World do right? 'tis in Gen. 18. 24, 25. Now if Abraham had a right Notion of God, which I no ways question, then it follows,

1st. That

1st. That the Decollation could not be a National Sin, since we have no Reason to believe that a tenth part of the Nation consented to it; The people of that day having been trained up in Principles contrary thereunto; and the House of Commons was purged over and over again, before any step could be made towards it; and at last it was done by *Cromwel* and a Juncto of the Army: And therefore this was not a National Act.

2^{dly}. Supposing this to have been a National Act and a National Sin too, there is yet no Reason to think, that National like Original Sin is transfused from one Generation to another; and since those who had a Hand in that Bloodshed are passed away, and a new Generation is now arisen, methinks 'tis very disagreeable to God's Justice, or even to the Notion which *Abraham* had of the Divine Being, to suppose that he will punish us merely for the Sins which our Forefathers have committed.

And altho some Texts of Scripture are hereupon cited in behalf of a contrary Opinion, yet these particular Texts seem to me to be dark and mysterious, in comparison to a very plain Sermon, preached by the Prophet *Ezekiel* upon this very Subject; wherein the whole Scope of the Prophet is, to shew that God does not punish the Son for the Sin of the Father, but that (on the contrary) every one is punished for his own Sin only. This

Discourse is to be read in the 18th Chapter of *Ezekiel*; and the whole of it is a matter of very fair belief, and therefore I lay no stress upon what some have conjectured, viz. that the Death of the Father has been sufficiently avenged by the Restoration of the two Sons, being fully satisfied that the punishing innocent Children for their Father's Sins may be consistent with the odd Opinion of two coordinate supreme Beings, whereof the one is extremely evil (such a Power may do Mischief for Mischiefs sake) but that one supreme Power infinitely just and good should do such a thing, surpasseth my Imagination: So that there is no necessity of continuing this Day upon the forementioned Account.

Add hereunto, that the Observation of this Day at present casts an ill Reflection (in the Opinion of some good People) upon the late Revolution: For as *Charles I.* was the Lord's Anointed, the rightful King of this Realm, so likewise was *James II.* as much anointed, as openly owned, as much *Jure Divino* as his Father. 'Tis true, we did not beneck him, but we drove him out of *England*, and beat him out of *Ireland* into *France*, where at last he broke his Heart and died.

Now *James II.* was only a Favourer of Popery, and an Overbearer of the Laws and Constitutions of *England*, as was *Charles I.* and if it were so horrid an Impiety to execute *Charles I.*
for

for setting his Will above the Law, and raising an Army to support the Oppression ; If this were an Impiety so horrid, that good Men ought not to converse with those who in any measure excuse it ; I think that those who allow of what befel *James II.* are by parity of Reason subjected to like Treatment : Only that Cardinal *Bellarmino* has laid down a Rule in their favour ; for that Noble Divine, when he instructed the *Roman Catholics* in their Duty of extirpating all Protestants Root and Branch, laid down this Caution, *Quod si haeretici sint fortiores nobis, quiescendum est pro tempore*, i. e. If the Hereticks should be too strong for us, we may let them alone for a Season. So that they who favour the late happy Revolution, may thank God that they are the stronger side. How long they may be suffered to continue so I know not : But if the present Ballance of *England* be changed, they must expect to fall under an Anniversary Excommunication. If therefore we would abstain from all Appearance of Evil, I think we may drop such an Anniversary day, as casts an ill Reflection both upon God and the King.

I know some Offers have been made to reconcile the Observation of this Day to the late Revolution, as was attempted in a Sermon preached two years since to the Honourable House : but then that Discourse had no Success. And in truth I must say
it:

it is an absurd attempt to reconcile a Fact for the Decollation of King *Charles I.* with a Feast for the Abdication of King *James II.*

But suppose the Observation of this Day should cast a seeming ill Reflection upon the Martyr himself, I hope you will allow me that it not only may, but ought to be abrogated. And for ought that I know, the Doctor himself may be perswaded to join with us in the same Conclusion. The Slur which this Day (as 'tis observed) casts upon the Martyr came to my knowledg thus; being one day looking into my Almanack in company with a Learned Divine, I asked him the reason why the Holydays were marked out in red Letters? to which he answered, that it was because the Martyrs lost their Blood upon those Days. I enquired further, why then do we keep those Days with rejoicing, on which the Martyrs lost their Lives? For this reason (said he) because the Primitive Church of Christ looked upon the dying Day of a Martyr to be his Birth-day into Glory: And for that reason (continued he) 'twas fit that those Days should be celebrated with Joy and Thankfulness (as in all Ages of the Christian Church they were) to signify the sure and certain Hope which all Christians had conceived of their admittance into Eternal Glory. If this be so, then our fasting weeping Day the 30th of *January*, is not only a Presbyterian Holiday, i. e. a Day observed

served in contradiction to the Current of all Christian Ages, but seems to cast a Slur upon the Martyr, by distinguishing him from all his Predecessors of the same Order, viz. by giving a Check to that Joy which ought to arise from our sure and certain Hope that he likewise among the Saints in Light inheriteth a Crown of Glory.

Furthermore had I Authority to advise, I would move that this Day may be set aside, if it were only for the sake of the Clergy of the Church of *England*: and tho some of them will not take a Man to be in earnest when he urges this Argument, yet I protest before God who knows the Secrets of all Hearts, that I am serious in this Argument, and mean no other thing than what I am going to say. I likewise protest that after having inform'd my self of the several Christian Churches, I know not of any one which I can prefer before the Church of *England*; nor do I think that there is any Clergy in the Christian World equal in all Parts of Human and Divine Learning to the Clergy of that Church. I pity from my Heart any Mistake that I think they run themselves into; and were it in my Power they should be the Joy and Glory of Christendom; nay I make no doubt but that if they were suffered to keep within the Bounds of their proper Function they would gain no Enemies, but on the contrary they would make their Church to appear (like the Spouse in the Canticles) *altogether lovely,*

lovely, and universally beloved. For that which has gained to this Clergy some Enemies at home, has been their intermeddling with Affairs of State. 'Tis well known what a great Disgust was once given to an Honourable House of Commons by the Sermons of Dr. Sibthorp and Dr. Manwaring, which were both political Discourses tending (in the Judgment of the House then sitting) to the Subversion of Property: and such like political Doctrines vented from the Pulpit (which the then Lord Faulkland called in Scorn *Pulpit Law*) gave the People at that time such an Aversion to the Clergy, as at last ended in the Subversion of the Church of *England*. And after the Restoration of the Church, together with King *Charles II.* I remember the Church gained to themselves many Enemies by their Zeal for promoting the dangerous Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance, to the promoting of which Doctrines the 30th of *January* gave a great Handle. The same political Principles being generally maintained by the Clergy, were thought to have given King *James* a Temptation to grasp at Arbitrary Power, by which he would soon have overturned both Church and State: And 'tis now evident that had the People believed those Doctrines, we had been long since irrecoverably lost, both as to Religion and Liberty. And at this day we see too many Clergy-men who have lost their Livings, and are in a starving Condition, because

because that according to the political Principles which they had formerly owned as Church Doctrines, they could not dispose of their Allegiance to his gracious Majesty who now reigns over us.

To sum up this matter, I never observed any more than two ways and means by which the Clergy gained themselves Enemies among the People; one whereof was by promoting the Execution of penal Laws against Dissenters. The other was by preaching such Doctrines, as seemingly were destructive to the just Rights and Liberties of *English* People.

At present the Toleration takes off the Edge of Dissenters from them, who cannot now be provoked by their encouraging of Persecution: and were they also so happy as to have no remaining Occasion to promote from their Pulpits any Politicks whatsoever, no Party could be provoked by them, but they would be safe under all Revolutions which support the Protestant Religion. The Bible is designed for Religion, and not Politicks. And altho there be two Books of Kings contained therein, yet since there is no Book of Parliaments, it cannot be supposed

D

posed to have any relation to the *English Constitution*: So that if the *Thirtieth of January*, and *Nine and twentieth of May* were set aside by Act of Parliament, the Clergy could have no Inducement to look into the Bible after such a sort of Doctrine, which is not there to be found; I mean disobliging Politicks.

Besides, Doctrines of Religion cannot be retorted to the Disadvantage of Men by the Change of Times, as Political Doctrines may. As for instance, should the *French King* impose his natural Grandson, whom he has proclaimed by the Name of *James III.* upon *England*, as he has sent his legitimate Grandson to *Spain*, the Consequence would be, that the *fifth Day of November* would be turned into a Fast, and then the People will be called upon from the Pulpit to withdraw themselves from all Familiarity with those wicked Men who abdicated the Lord's Anointed, and introduced an Heretical Usurper into his Throne. The Preacher upon that solemn Fast will say (as the Doctor lately did) *What Opinion must all Lookers on entertain, when they see the Professors of Religion unequally yoked together with its declared Enemies? How unnatural, how monstrous must the Alliance be, when*
the

the Clean are paired with the Unclean ? For what Fellowship hath Righteousness with Unrighteousness ? Or what Communion hath Light with Darkness ? Or what Concord hath Christ with Belial ? Or what part hath he that believeth with an Infidel ? But yet notwithstanding these Texts of Scripture, which the Doctor citeth upon the Occasion of his January Doctrine, I am still of opinion that those Texts of Holy Writ, and also the whole Book of God stands neuter as to the Political Revolutions of *England*. And if the Clergy of the Church of *England* might in these political Contentions, observe as strict a Neutrality as the Scripture doth, they would be the Delight of the whole People of *England*, and their Church would be established as the Center of the Universe.

As to the other Doctor's Sermon to the Lower House of Convocation, 'twas of the same piece with that before the Commons, full of high Flights, and Rhetorical Decorations. But to draw a Parallel between the Impiety of those who crucified Jesus Christ our Saviour, and those who beheaded King *Charles*, requires an Audience strongly biassed in favour of the Preacher. Such a Comparison would better become the

D 2

Mouth

Mouth of a Socinian, than a Convocation-man: forasmuch as if our Lord Jesus Christ were only Man and not God, another Man may decently be compared to him, and perhaps be equalled with him. But to affirm Christ's Prayer upon the Cross (which was the Text upon which he preached his Sermon) was not answered by God the Father, is (in my poor Opinion) no less than giving up the Deity of our Saviour, and his Identity with the Father. The Doctor's Text was this, *Father forgive them, for they know not what they do*: And in a certain Paragraph of his Sermon, which is contained in the 15th and 16th Pages of it, he says (as to me it seems) that this Prayer of our Saviour Jesus Christ *did not obtain the Forgiveness requested*. Very strange! That a Sin of Ignorance was not forgiven by God the Father upon the Request of God the Son, who is one and the same God with the Father!

Truly I am apt to think that this Prayer might be supposed to have had its Effect; nay the Doctor himself might allow it upon any Day of the Year, except the 30th of January: But since on that day the Doctor was unwilling to grant that the like Prayer of the Martyr was heard by God; and since that God's refusing to hear

hear the Martyr might be some Diminution to his high Character, it was convenient to suppose that God did not hear the Prayer, which his Son made to the same purpose: And besides, should God have pardoned the Sin of this Nation in beheading King *Charles*, there would no Pretence remain for the *January Fast*.

But that I may not wrong the Doctor, I will transcribe his whole Paragraph. *But whether either the Prayer of our Saviour on the Cross, or of our Royal Martyr on the Scaffold, and in his Closet very frequently before his Death, did obtain the Forgiveness requested, whilst the Wickedness continued and was not repented of, is the next thing we are to consider as my second General Head: And we shall quickly find that it did not.* It seems clear to me that Sins of Ignorance are repented of by every one who repents of Sin in the General; and since 'twas the Prayer of Christ, that the Sin of Ignorance which the *Jews* committed in his Crucifixion should be pardoned, I see no Umbrage to suppose that his Prayer did not obtain the Forgiveness requested.

Our Saviour Jesus Christ was of a forgiving Disposition, and enjoined his Followers to forgive

give that they might be forgiven : And I heartily wish that no Opportunity were either given to, or taken by any of the Ministers of Jesus Christ, to shew any other Disposition of Mind, than what becomes the Followers of the Lamb of God ; that none of them may discover so much ill Nature and Uncharitableness, as did a certain Doctor, who preaching on the same Text, and upon the same occasion, gave the Words this turn, *Father, forgive them not, for they knew what they did.* I shall conclude with that seasonable Petition of our Church in her Litany, *From Envy, Hatred and Malice, and all Uncharitableness, Good Lord deliver us.*

I am, SIR,

Yours, &c.



FINIS